

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on September 16, 2004.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, 17, 22, 24, and 46 are amended. No claims are canceled or added. As a result, claims 1, 3-46, and 48 are now pending in this application.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant's remarks concerning the claims will be presented in the same order in which the Examiner presented them in the Office Action.

Amendments to the Title

The title has been amended to more accurately reflect the claimed subject matter by substituting "Systems" for "System", and by substituting "Methods" for "Method".

Amendments to Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, 17, 22, 24, and 46

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, 17, 22, 24, and 46 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Independent claims 1, 22, and 46 have been amended by adding the phrase "but not being illegible to a display user". Support for this language may be found, for example, on page 3, lines 8-9, of the written description.

Independent claim 8 has been amended by substituting "having reduced legibility but not being illegible to a user of the computer" for "being illegible". Support may be found as cited above.

Independent claim 15 has been amended by substituting "having reduced legibility but not being illegible to a user of the user device" for "being illegible". Support may be found as cited above.

Dependent claims 3, 10, 17, and 24 have been amended by substituting "unblurred" for "legible". Support for this language may be found, for example, on page 3, lines 6-7, of the written description.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 23, 29, and 46
under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as Anticipated by Masumoto**

Claims 1, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 23, 29, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Masumoto et al. (U.S. 2002/0036652).

Masumoto discloses a presentation system comprising a projector 200 (FIG. 11) coupled to a personal computer 100. Certain text written in a designated font (FIG. 10) is displayed on a display 102 and visible to the presenter, but it is not displayed on a display 90 viewable by an audience (refer to page 4, paragraphs 0071-0072). It will be noted in Masumoto that text is either fully displayed or invisible to an audience (see paragraphs 0110 and 0116, for example).

The rule under 35 U.S.C. §102 is well settled that “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2D 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP §2131.

Masumoto fails to disclose all of the elements recited in claim 1, as amended. For example, Masumoto doesn’t disclose the modified data having “reduced legibility but not being illegible to a display user”. Masumoto discloses the data being invisible, which is to be distinguished from having “reduced legibility”.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that “The modified data is invisible when display corresponds to legibility being reduced”. Applicant respectfully asserts the Examiner is not using an accepted dictionary definition of “legible”. For example, the *Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary*, Eleventh Edition, Merriam-Webster Incorporated, Springfield, Massachusetts, 2003 defines “legible” as “1. capable of being read or deciphered”. Thus, the term “reduced legibility” does not mean “invisible” or “illegible”. In a consistent manner, the same dictionary defines “illegible” as “not legible”.

For the above reasons, claim 1 should be found to be allowable over Masumoto, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Masumoto be withdrawn.

Claims 3-7, which depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above.

Independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 46, which have a similar limitation to that discussed above, are asserted to be allowable over Masumoto for the same reasons. The claims dependent from independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 46 are also asserted to be allowable over Masumoto, for the reasons presented above and for the other elements or limitations recited in those claims.

Rejection of Claims 3-7, 10-14, 17-21, 24-28, and 48
under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Unpatentable
over Masumoto in view of Parikh

Claims 3-7, 10-14, 17-21, 24-28, and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto et al. and further in view of Parikh et al. (U.S. 5,801,697).

Masumoto was discussed above.

Parikh discloses an information security feature for a laptop computer, in which a visible area (50, FIG. 2) within an overall obscured area (52, FIG. 2) may be defined by user action, e.g. by moving a mouse pointer or in various other ways (col. 2, lines 64-67). The appearance of the obscured area may be varied by the user, e.g. by altering the color or intensity (col. 2, lines 47-51). The user can designate a predefined area to always remain visible, e.g., a date or title (col. 3, lines 1-6). The size of the visible area may be varied by the user (col. 3, lines 35-37).

The Examiner stated that “claims 3-7, 10-14, 17-21, 24-28, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto as applied to claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 above, and further in view of Parikh”. Applicant respectfully asserts that because Matsumoto was shown above not to disclose all of the elements of claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, then claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are patentable over Matsumoto. It logically follows that claims 3-7, 10-14, 17-21, 24-28, and 48 also are patentably distinguishable over Matsumoto, whether or not combined with additional references, such as Parikh. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. MPEP §2143.03.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3-7, 10-14, 17-21, 24-28, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Parikh should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 30-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)
as Unpatentable over Masumoto

Claims 30-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto et al.

Claims 30-45 are all dependent upon independent claim 1, which was asserted above to be allowable over Matsumoto, so they too should be allowable. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. MPEP §2143.03.

Additional Elements and Limitations

Applicant considers additional elements and limitations of claims 1, 3-46, and 48 to further distinguish over the cited references, and Applicant reserves the right to present arguments to this effect at a later date.

Documents Cited But Not Relied Upon For This Office Action

Applicant need not respond to the assertion of pertinence stated for the references cited but not relied upon by the Office Action, because these references are not made part of the rejections in this Office Action. Applicant is expressly not admitting to this assertion and reserves the right to address the assertion should it form part of future rejections.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-46, and 48 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Walter W. Nielsen (located in Phoenix, Arizona) at (602) 298-8920, or the below-signed attorney (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD O. CLAPPER

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

(612) 373-6970

Date

February 16, 2005

By

Charles E. Steffey

Charles E. Steffey

Reg. No. 25,179

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 16th day of February 2005.

Dennis Kamph

Name

Signature

[Signature]